

### **Remarks**

By the present amendment, claims 1 and 3-20 are pending, claims 1, 17 and 18 are amended and claims 19 and 20 are added, leaving claims 3-16 unchanged. Claim 2 was canceled and claims 3, 5 and 9-16 were withdrawn in a previous amendment.

The drawings are objected to for not illustrating every feature in the claims. The drawings have been amended to illustrate the structure S or motor vehicle body.

The specification is objected to for not pointing out every feature in the claims. The identified S has been added to denote the structure or motor vehicle body. The specification is also objected to for interchangeably using both the term “screw image” and the term “screw layout”. The specification is amended to set forth one term throughout.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs. Applicants assert that claim 18 is supported by the specification. Namely, paragraphs 6, 9, 18, 21, 28 and 30 provide support for the subject matter of claim 18. Claim 18 has been amended to clarify that the housing part refers back to the housing part introduced in claim 1. Claim 18 has also been amended to claim that the fixing dome is “configured to slide”.

Claims 1, 6-8, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Blackenburg et al. (US 4,216,624).

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackenburg et al.

Claim 1 is amended to set forth that the fixing dome (6, 7, 8, 9) is configured to be displaced along the groove (21) before its fixation on the housing part (2) in order to establish a position that corresponds to the screw layout. Applicants thank the examiner for the June 7 and June 10, 2010 telephonic interviews with the undersigned Applicants’ Representative. During the interviews, the slidable relationship between the fixing domes and the groove were discussed. As discussed during the interview, Blackenburg does not teach a groove along which fixing domes are slideable. Rather, Blackenburg discloses a detent step 39 that engages a detent nose 36 on a projection 36.

Blackenburg does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable in view of Blackenburg. Claims 3-20 depend from claim 1, and are

allowable for at least the reasons indicated above, and for other reasons not specifically discussed herein.

Applicants respectfully submit that upon allowance of a generic claim, such as claim 1, Applicants are entitled to have withdrawn claims 3, 5 and 9-16 examined.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of claims 1 and 3-20.

If additional consultation will further prosecution, the undersigned is available during normal business hours at the below-identified telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

/julianne m. cozad smith/

Julianne M. Cozad Smith  
Reg. No. 62,174

Docket No. 022862-1077-00

Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Suite 3300  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108  
414.271.6560